CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

October 18, 2012

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review

in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Lara

Sirois, Mike Nichols

EXCUSED ABSENCE: None

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Fischer, Principal Planner; Kelsey Johnson, Associate Planner

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:02 p.m.

MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 6, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (3-0) WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.

Mr. Krueger arrived at the meeting at this point.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2012 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

APPROVAL

L120403, Bear Creek Apartments

Description: 6-story mixed-use building; 65,509 SF of multi-family and commercial with one level of

underground parking

Location: Union Hill Road and 178th PI NE

Applicant: Nora Pena Klenner with Driscoll Architects

Prior Review Date: 08-02-12 & 08-16-12

Staff Contact: Kelsey Johnson, kmjohnson@redmond.gov or 425-556-2409

Ms. Johnson noted that this project came before the DRB on August 2nd and August 16th, 2012. During the August 16th meeting, a majority of the design issues were resolved. The only outstanding item was the color scheme. Two alternatives have been proposed. Staff is recommending approval with the first alternative presented, but the Board will make the final decision.

Nora Pena Klenner presented to the Board on behalf of the applicant with the color schemes. Alternative One is a blue-gray scheme. The materials in the middle are shared between the two schemes. Alternative Two is a red-gray scheme. The applicant noted that the second alternative had more of a red component on top and a lighter light gray on the bottom. The first alternative has more grays and blues on the top with more red along the bottom to define the commercial space.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked where the hardy panel and metal panel would be placed. The applicant said, on Alternative Two for example, there is a traditional red that would be horizontal plank siding. The vertical circulation would be a toned-down yellow color. The iron gray color would be hardy panel with a wood grain look to it. The metal panel would smooth.
- The applicant noted there would be a cool blue-gray stained concrete at the bottom of the building, and a vertical, cool metallic silver metal panel with no standing seams.
- The black anodized aluminum storefront would be glass. The main difference between the alternatives is the color of the stained concrete and the color of the hardy-plank.

Mr. Meade:

- Mr. Meade asked about the windows on the upper floor. The applicant said they would be a silver metallic, which would blend in with the gray.
- Some of the windows have some red in between to provide some pop, which is a design element in both alternatives.

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked, on the hardy panel, about how the joints were treated where they come together. The
 applicant said T-brackets would be used, but they are decorative in nature.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed that the look would be a smooth plane with joints that look like reveals on the panel itself.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the brick element and where it would be placed. The applicant said that would be used on the paving of the black plaza area.
- The applicant said the color of the brick, a shade of rose, would look good with either color alternative. The pavers would be impermeable.

Ms. Sirois:

Said the questions she asked had been answered.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Preferred Alternative Two for color. He said the red base in Alternative One is too strong and emphasizes the horizontal nature of the building too much.
- Ms. Sirois agreed with that assessment, and said the red along the bottom would be too much for pedestrians at the ground level. She thought the gray at the bottom would look good with the black anodized windows.

Mr. Krueger:

- Liked the second alternative, but did like the stained concrete involved in Alternative One.
- He thought the five residential floors in Alternative One looked too similar to each other. He liked the
 variety provided in Alternative Two. The applicant said she was working with the colors provided by
 the hardy plank manufacturer.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said either alternative could work, but he leaned toward Alternative One because of the way the retail
 is recessed underneath the tower on both sides, which could provide some brightness for the retail
 operations there.
- He said that the tower looks more broken up in the upper portion of the second color scheme with the accent red areas. He could go with either alternative, but he was concerned about having the retail area far back from the street, covered by overhangs and shielded by rows of trees.
- Beyond that, purely with the color scheme, he would go with either option.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked if the color schemes could be combined, and if the red stain color could be included in Alternative Two. Ms. Sirois said she would not have a problem with that, but wanted to make sure it was not too bright and lively. She suggested a less saturated color than bright red.
- Mr. Nichols said the blue-gray color gives a better backdrop for the retail signage than the red.
- Ms. Johnson asked if a nice, finished concrete would be acceptable rather than adding any stain.
- Mr. Meade said he liked Alternative Two, but asked the Board if a lighter gray, with a natural concrete
 color, would be acceptable at the base.
- Mr. Waggoner said that would be a good look, too, and could reflect some light in the overhang areas. Mr. Krueger said he could agree with that, and noted if it did not work, it could be painted.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. SIROIS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE L120403, BEAR CREEK APARTMENTS, WITH THE EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS AND COLOR SCHEME PROVIDED BY ALTERNATIVE TWO, AS PRESENTED BY THE APPLICANT. THE COLOR OF THE BASE WOULD BE CHANGED TO A NATURAL, FINISHED CONCRETE. THE PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES STANDARD CONDITION WOULD APPLY. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

APPROVAL

L120390, Marymoor Assisted Living

Description: Remodel of existing assisted living facility to include a new entrance canopy and the

removal of the residential balconies

Location: 4585 West Lake Sammamish Parkway

Applicant: Catherine Calvert

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer, sfischer@redmond.gov or 425-556-2432

Mr. Fischer said this project is down in at West Lake Sammamish and Bel-Red Road on a prominent triangular intersection that gets through traffic on both sides. This building was built in 1992, and has aged some, but has been well-maintained. The applicant is looking to upgrade the facility in three areas. The first area is the balconies, which are starting to rot and deteriorate, and which may provide a hazard with the residents. The applicant is proposing to remove the balconies and replace them with trellises. The second key component is the entrance. Currently, there is a vinyl covered canopy at the entry. The applicant is proposing a heavy timber frame construction that cantilevers over a drop-off area on a circular drive. The last piece involves general exterior repairs to take care of some water intrusion problems. The Board does not need to concern itself over these repairs, as they are general maintenance. A little gazebo, a generator, and some outdoor amenities have been added, which Mr. Fischer said were minor additions and could be considered general landscaping. Staff is recommending approval of the building elevations, colors, and materials. The materials and colors would be similar to what the Board has seen before. The presentation materials inconsistencies standard would be the only condition that would apply.

Catherine Calvert presented on behalf of the applicant. She spoke about removing the balconies, which include cantilevered balconies and balconies that are set into the peaked vertical elements set away from the façade. In both cases, the balcony floor structure would be removed and replaced with a trellis made of heavy timber or something with a heavy timber look such as Trex. On the west side of the building, the balcony floors are inset into the vertical elements. To avoid any visual confusion, and for resident safety, the applicant is proposing to remove the sliding glass doors that lead out onto the balconies. Those would be replaced with windows for emergency egress only. The area below the windows would be filled in with stucco to match the existing walls.

With regard to the entrance, the applicant noted that the current entrance is a vinyl green canopy over a temporary metal frame. To improve the quality of this experience, a new entry canopy of heavy timber with architectural shingles to match the existing building has been proposed. The cover would cantilever over part of the entrance driveway to improve weather protection for people getting dropped off at the entrance. The applicant said the new entry has a good regional reference with its materials and forms and improves the overall entry experience.

General repairs have been proposed to stop water intrusion throughout the building, especially around the chimney areas. Materials would be replaced, like for like, at the base of the building where rain splash has caused deterioration. Various repairs have been identified at the balconies and other spots around the building. The entire building would be repainted with a neutral color that is similar to the existing color. Mr. Meade asked about the arched chimney. The applicant said it would remain in place. The top of it would likely have some metal flashing around it.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the use of Trex for the trellis material. He asked if Trex made profiles that big. Mr. Meade did not think so.
- Mr. Nichols told the applicant that Trex might not give her the look she was looking for. He encouraged real wood for the trellis elements.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked if the framing for the balconies would remain, basically taking out the floor but leaving the
 perimeter. The applicant said that was not the case. The elements appearing on the outside of the
 building would be new elements.
- Mr. Palmquist said the member sizes and the spacing seems off on the infill trellises. He suggested adding another layer, perhaps using 2 x 2's running in another direction. He said the pieces of the front entry look good, but suggested shortening up the spacing in this area to make it look less flimsy.

Mr. Meade:

- Said some of the heavy wood elements in the entry stick out too far and would be difficult to support.
- Ms. Sirois agreed that the entry canopy looked too heavy. She liked the proportions at the entry, and said the size of the members and their rhythm is working well.
- Regarding the trellises, Ms. Sirois said they were simply too heavy.
- Mr. Meade asked about the member sizes illustrated at the entry. The applicant said 2 x 10's would be used on the cantilevered part. The beams would be 4 x 12 beams.
- The applicant said the heaviest part appears at the part where the wood comes together at a right angle. She said everywhere else, there are different angles that follow the angle of the setback. The area identified as "heavy" by the Board needs a special connection.
- Mr. Meade suggesting dialing down the size of the wood beams, and talked about using 2 x 10's and 2 x 8's, with some 2 x 2's going across, as Mr. Palmquist suggested. Mr. Meade said the beam is too far out, and should be slid back to see the back cut of the trellis. That should help with the span problem that exists now.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested putting a jack in to turn the corner on the wood element. Mr. Meade said supporting that element with a cable might be prudent, as well. A knee brace might be in order.
- Ms. Sirois liked the idea of wrapping around the wood where it becomes shallower. A three or fourfoot distance would be sufficient, so as not to encroach into the window areas. The applicant noted that such an idea might create an encroachment into the setback.
- Mr. Palmquist asked staff if a canopy could encroach in a setback. Mr. Fischer said it was a 30-foot street setback. Roof eaves can encroach, but he was unsure if a trellis element could have that type of latitude.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested bringing both supporting members of the entry trellis back, such that when the corner turns, it would be flush with the outside of the building and on the setback already. He said this was simply a visual concern. The bottom beam of the trellis would move back toward the chimney to allow room to turn the corner with a proper overhang.
- Mr. Meade suggested forgetting about the return for simplification. But, he said the knee brace would be a good idea, as well as the other subtle moves suggested by the Board earlier. The applicant clarified that the DRB was looking for some detail at the corner of the entry trellis.
- Mr. Meade agreed, and said the corner in question would need some support via a knee brace. Ms.
 Sirois said the materials would be lightened up with that brace, as well.
- Mr. Meade said the members on top have a good length, but the frame underneath them has to shrink by a half or a third to get to where the overhang works well and one would read this element as

a trellis. The applicant said her proposal honored what was in place before. She clarified that the DRB was looking to disconnect that relationship to change the proportion of the trellis.

- Mr. Palmquist noted that the changes proposed would happen all the way around to the entry trellis.
- Mr. Meade asked about the proportion of the entry overall. He said the beams on the side looked enormous. Ms. Sirois asked about this element, as well. The applicant noted that a fire lane complicates this area of the design, in that the timbers cannot come out too far.
- Ms. Sirois asked about the timber that would be used. The applicant said she had found some interesting pieces of reclaimed timber.
- The applicant added that there are other conditions around the back side of the building. Structurally, the proposal keeps the lines and angles of the building. Structurally, if the trellis was to be moved back, that would change that relationship.
- Mr. Meade noted that change, and recommended having similar overhangs, so as to have the same overhang relationship with the upper members of the structure. Those members would be extended a little more.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the wood color, and if it would be a natural stain.
- The applicant agreed that would be the case, and said it would be a good complement to the mushroom color of the exterior.
- Asked if the new color proposed for the exterior would be too dark. The applicant said it might appear dark, but it is lighter in its actual application.
- Mr. Krueger asked about a lattice wall covering up the mechanical elements at the ground level. The applicant said there would be a structure with a supporting frame and a door for access. Mr. Krueger said that would be a great idea. The applicant said it would be a wood lattice.
- Mr. Meade asked about the material for that lattice. The applicant said it would be custom-made. Mr.
 Nichols said cheap lattice sheets should not be used, in that this is a prominent area of the building.
- Mr. Krueger said the drawing of the lattice looks nice as presented.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said his fellow DRB members covered the deck and trellis elements. He had the same concern about the color of the exterior paint, but believed it would look different in daylight.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about a scheme for lighting inside the entry canopy. The applicant said a combination of up-lighting and down-lighting would be used.
- Mr. Waggoner said the project was a nice upgrade. He said the trellis elements give the site a height and sense of quality that are improvement over the balconies and decks that exist right now. He supported the applicant's proposal.
- Mr. Meade recommended flashing the caps of the large timbers at the entry where they extend beyond the roof. He asked the Board for a motion.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE L120390, MARYMOOR ASSISTED LIVING, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE APPLICANT WILL LOOK AT THE MEMBER SIZING AND LOCATION OF THE SUPPORTING MEMBERS FOR THE TRELLISES ALL AROUND THE BUILDING.
- 2. A KNEE BRACE DETAIL WILL BE CONSIDERED AT THE CORNER OF THE TRELLISES.
- 3. THE EXTERIOR COLOR WOULD BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED.
- 4. THE PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES STANDARD CONDITION WOULD APPLY.

MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

L120407, Bear Creek Village

Description: Remodel of the Bear Creek Shopping Center

Location: 17246 Redmond Way

Applicant: Theo Manning

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer, <u>sfischer@redmond.gov</u> or 425-556-2432

Mr. Palmquist recused himself from this discussion, as he works for the applicant. He left the meeting during this presentation. Mr. Fischer said this project has come before the Board in bits and pieces over the last several years. There have been retail storefront improvements, one at a time, to many of the retail spaces here. Now, the applicant is looking at finishing the rest of the center using similar themes that have been used in the past. There are three principal buildings involved in this approval. Building A is the large building opposite of Safeway. The Agave and Ross storefronts are here. The adjustments proposed for this building include two tower elements to be added to the large tenant spaces. The southern portion of the building will have some improvements as well, which will be presented to the Board at this meeting. Building B is a smaller building on the north end of the project. The applicant is proposing new parapet walls. The roof overhangs on the side and back of the building will be removed with a parapet sitting on top of the existing CMU walls. New columns would be added in some locations. Building C is the Safeway building, and has changes from north to south. The north elevation faces out towards Avondale. A new parapet wall has been proposed on the entire north elevation, wrapping around to the west face and to the second column. New tower features would be built on the northeast corner as well as the angled corner. The Rite Aid building would be reshaped. The Lane Bryant would be reshaped, as well. The Panera building would get new cornices and copings. The Safeway would be repainted.

Staff has a question regarding Building C in the staff report. There is a little flat wall that is proposed to be painted to carry the color scheme across the project. Right now, this is just a masonry wall. Staff asked why that wall could not continue to the corner of the project. This is a part of the site that does face out towards Avondale. The landscaping is transparent through this area in winter and early spring. Second, staff asked the DRB to look at, on the north portion, a parapet wall that is proposed. There could be a challenge to turn the corner in this area. The third concern of staff is the color scheme of Safeway, a corporate color palette. Staff is asking the Board how those colors fit in with the rest of the shopping center. Staff is still recommending approval of the project in terms of colors and materials and building elevations as presented, but wants the DRB to consider the questions noted above.

Theo Manning presented on behalf of the applicant. He explained the tower elements involved in Building A, which were put in place to break up the long massing of the face of this building. The mansard roof would be removed in this location, and the color scheme would be continued through. Structural columns around the doorways would have to be added. A concrete masonry wall, as Mr. Fischer mentioned, runs from the older part of the building to the newer part. The wall could be painted to blend in with the project. An aged parapet feature would be replaced on Building B to create a new sign area. Also, some columns would be added to create some fullness to the project. Building C will be painted, completely. The applicant showed the Board the existing conditions of the shopping center, with the idea to follow some of the language of the current storefronts.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the wall at the south end of Building A that faces towards Redmond Way.
- The applicant said that wall would be painted. The focus of the project is more on the interior areas of the shopping center.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked for a description of the side elevations and if the elements presented return towards the structure. The applicant said one single plane is proposed for this area. The same walls on site now will be used, and the column placement would be strategic.
- A small reveal might be used along this elevation. The paint would break it up.
- Mr. Meade asked if the elevation would look like a mass or a Hollywood front. He confirmed with the applicant that a returning side would head back toward the main structure. The same situation would happen with the upper parapet piece.
- Mr. Meade asked about Building B and why the darker color was not used here. The applicant said
 this building does not have an anchor tenant. The idea was to celebrate the corners a little bit, but
 there would be signage placed here as well.

- Mr. Meade said the multi-colored schemes in the shopping center are more successful, and suggested bringing that concept to this building, somehow. He said the DSW storefront's black signage looked great, and he wanted to see more of that concept.
- The applicant said more of the main color could be brought back into Building B. The DSW signage is specific to that store. The applicant said he would consider tying back in the middle color on the site. Mr. Meade agreed with that, and suggested making the entire corner elements that color, which could help pull the project together. Right now, he believes Building B is underserved, and this building gets a lot of use due to Safeway and Starbucks. He wanted a sexier look for this building.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said there was a long, boring elevation to Building B facing Avondale. The applicant said the decision
 was made to build up on this side to create signage space and create some excitement for tenants
 and people coming into the shopping center.
- However, the applicant said that wall could be broken up a little. Mr. Meade said the building would need changes in color all the way around.
- The applicant noted that the column locations, previously, supported another gabled element and did not help entry to the tenant spaces. That has been corrected to help the middle tenants. Also, columns have been added around the side of Building B.

Mr. Meade:

- Liked the idea of providing a similar column theme around the mall. Mr. Meade was concerned about how tight the walkway is at the Starbucks. He suggested a plainer piece in this area with a similar look and feel so as to promote foot traffic flow in this area. He suggested the same action could be taken with the plinth to improve its function.
- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification of the light and dark colors shown. He said he liked how they looked in the photos rather than in the color palette presented at the meeting.
- The applicant showed, on Building C, where the north elevation faces out. This is a very visible area. A tower element has been proposed with a recessed sign area. That has been carried across using the existing columns.
- The applicant is proposing angling off the area between two columns so as to avoid the deep area underneath the soffit and open this spot up for mall signage, possibly.
- The applicant noted where the Rite-Aid had a circular parapet and metal, decorative features proposed. That parapet has been heightened, and new copings and paint have been added. Signs will be repositioned as needed.
- The Safeway has standard colors, and the applicant feels he can make the color schemes mesh nicely with the rest of the project. A darker color is on top with lighter colors on the middle and bottom.
- The Lane Bryant space is next door to the Verizon tower. That tower would get some added height, new copings, and new cornices. The same color scheme would be used.
- Around the corner on the south elevation, which gets a lot of exposure, the paint will be redone. The awnings will remain, and signs will be moved as needed.

Ms. Sirois:

- Asked about the brick staff was concerned about, and if that brick wrapped around the corner. Mr.
 Fischer said that was difficult to see on the elevations and provided an aerial look for a better view.
- Mr. Fischer said this corner has a face that is visible from Avondale. In winter and early spring, the vegetation is sparse and does not provide proper screening. He believes this is an unfinished piece where the building stops at the tenant space and does not quite go to the corner.
- Rather than just put some paint on it, Mr. Fischer recommended bringing the improvements to the corner to give it a better look.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Asked about the spacing between the columns, especially around DSW. Some appear to be only six feet apart. The applicant admitted that the distance was probably close to that.
- The applicant said there is no glazing behind those columns, but the idea is to balance out the elevation. The existing conditions appear to be top-heavy, in the applicant's estimation.
- Mr. Krueger agreed that the project would look strange without the two new columns added.

- Mr. Waggoner said it simply appeared that there were a lot of columns, which might make access to the stores difficult for pedestrians.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed that the applicant was making no modifications to the west side of the Panera storefront.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked Mr. Meade what he thought about the Safeway colors. Mr. Meade said, with respect to Safeway, that the store would miss out because the palette appears dull. However, he said that some variety would be needed.
- Mr. Meade added that more people would be looking at the DSW sign, which appears more tailored, rather than the Safeway sign.

Mr. Meade:

- Said he understood the medallions or inserted color pieces proposed as a way to control color on the site, but he really liked the organization of the DSW storefront better in terms of masses and colors.
 Mr. Meade suggested making the towers one individual color. That could carry down to the columns, too, to bring the columns into the color scheme.
- Mr. Meade said it appears Panera is getting cheated, too, in that all that has been added is a new
 coping on top. The applicant said there are currently some newer light fixtures and awnings that
 Panera would like to keep, as part of their branding.
- Mr. Meade and Mr. Nichols asked about the corner transition that staff was concerned about, which appears to be a dead spot. Mr. Fischer said the parapet in this spot has an uncommon angle, and he was not sure how it would look for people driving into the shopping center.
- Franklin Ng spoke to the Board on behalf of the applicant. He noted, regarding the tower design that staff is concerned about, that the idea was to bring the main colors around the corner of the project.
 Also, the back sides of the buildings will be painted, which should break up the blank walls of the site.
- The applicant said this element is not being ignored, but rather, the idea is to integrate the tower around the corner a bit more. Mr. Krueger said a similar look was provided on Building A.

Ms. Sirois:

- Suggested anchoring the corner a bit more, perhaps in a similar way to the far left tower, which uses the medium color successfully.
- Ms. Sirois said that addition of color could help a lot to give it more mass. She asked how far back the parapet would return. The applicant said it would go back to the roof.

Mr. Nichols:

- Noted that Mr. Fischer's concern was valid, and asked if someone walking by could see behind the second tower and see the supports for the false front of the building. He asked if that would be objectionable to look at for people passing by.
- Mr. Nichols suggested bringing the tower element further around to create a three-sided tower of sorts. He asked if the tower elements would stick out from the main plane of the building.
- The applicant said in most cases, the towers are in the same plane. However, when the towers are next to an existing wall, they do stick out slightly because the applicant is using the existing framing.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked if there were any adjustments planned for the landscaping. The applicant noted that the shopping center is in the middle of a landscape renovation. New plantings have been added, but those may take a while to fill in.
- Mr. Meade said this project might have to come back to the Board, especially with Building B and the comments noted at this meeting. He added that Building C and its masonry, with the return on the tower element, needs more work.
- The Board members agreed. Ms. Sirois said more study is needed on the corner element. Mr. Nichols suggested the applicant could provide a view of the buildings from the road to assist the Board with its deliberations.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the columns at the Rite-Aid and how they line up. He asked if making these columns consistent with the rest of the site would be a problem.
- The applicant said the tall storefront windows could be hidden with taller columns.
- Mr. Nichols said, overall, this is a great facelift to the center with some good improvements over the current, dated design. Mr. Meade said the project was coming together.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the Rite-Aid, and noted that the coping on the building makes it look slightly set back. He suggested extending the brown color from the two side pods over to the next reveal wall above the columns. The coping might have to be extended in this case, as well. The applicant said he would consider making some changes to this storefront.
- The DRB and the applicant thanked each other, and Mr. Meade said the applicant could come back at a later meeting for approval. The applicant is hoping to start on this project in early 2013.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0), AS MR. PALMQUIST HAD ALREADY LEFT THE MEETING.

December 6, 2012	
MINUTES APPROVED ON	RECORDING SECRETARY